



Large Jail Network Bulletin

Annual Issue 1996

LARGE JAIL NETWORK BULLETIN

Annual Issue 1996

Contents

| | |
|---|------------------|
| <i>Foreword</i> | <i>2</i> |
| <i>Selecting High Level Corrections Staff</i> | <i>3</i> |
| <i>Controlling Gangs Through Teamwork and Technology</i> | <i>7</i> |
| <i>The Crunch Is On: Pinellas County Reinvents Its Jail</i> | <i>11</i> |
| <i>Sharing Information Via the Internet: A Large Jail Network Mailing List</i> | <i>14</i> |
| <i>The Role of the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Pretrial Detention</i> | <i>16</i> |
| <i>Recommended Reading</i> | <i>19</i> |

The *Large Jail Network Bulletin* is prepared by staff of LIS, Inc., for the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. The purpose of the *Bulletin* is to provide a forum for the discussion of issues and ideas. The contents of the articles and the points of view expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the National Institute of Corrections. Questions or comments should be referred to the NIC Information Center, 1860 Industrial Circle, Suite A, Longmont, Colorado, 80501; (800) 877-1461.

Foreword

This 1996 annual issue of ***the Large Jail Network Bulletin*** highlights two current NIC initiatives:

- The Office of Correctional Job Training and Placement (OCJTP), created by the Congress, was established within NIC in March 1995. Among its functions has been the development of a bibliography of materials on offender and ex-offender job training and placement programs, employment outcomes, and related materials. The forthcoming bibliography lists nearly 300 documents from the collection of NIC's Robert J. Kutak Library, located with the NIC Information Center in Longmont, Colorado.

We encourage Network members to share with OCJTP additional materials from your agencies. Such items could include program descriptions and evaluations, training materials, and other literature. Send new materials for the OCJTP collection to the NIC Information Center, 1860 Industrial Circle, Longmont, Colorado, 80501, or call the Information Center to request a copy of the bibliography when available. For more information about OCJTP, contact John Moore at the Office of Correctional Job Training and Placement, National Institute of Corrections, (800) 995-6423, ext. 147.

- A second current NIC initiative is the development of a Large Jail Network presence on the Internet. The Network mailing list is described in an article in this issue, beginning on page 14.

As always, the primary purpose of the Large ***Jail Network Bulletin*** is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and technological innovations among administrators of large jail systems, and the articles in this issue continue that tradition. The ***Bulletin*** and Network meetings are designed to reinforce for the field NIC's belief that large jail systems collectively possess the expertise and experience to adequately meet any challenge that a single jurisdiction might face. Contents of the articles and the points of view expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect my position or the position of the National Institute of Corrections.

The success of both the ***Bulletin*** and the Large Jail Network continue to depend on the interest and involvement of the large jail systems' administrators. Thank you for continuing to make the ***Bulletin*** and Network an effective information exchange.

Richard Geaither
Correctional Program Specialist
NIC Jails Division
Longmont, Colorado

Selecting High Level Corrections Staff

**by Susan McCampbell,
Director, Broward County
Sheriff's Office, Fort
Lauderdale, Florida**

Fhis article explores one process for selecting high-level corrections staff. I also discuss here our obligation, as corrections managers, to train the next generation of executives.

Identifying the Most Qualified Candidates

The hiring process described here is designed to identify the most qualified candidates among those applying from both inside and outside the organization. This process is used in the Broward Sheriff's Office (BSO) for selecting high-level personnel in all areas of operations. The skills and traits measured by this method are leadership, the abilities to organize and plan, perception and analysis, judgment and decision-making, interpersonal skills, oral communications, and written communications.

One advantage of the selection process is that it has credibility among existing staff, as they have either personally gone through it or have seen its results. Community leaders are also invited to participate in the hiring procedure, which ensures that their concerns are

addressed and that they are confident of its objectivity.

The process seeks to document and measure the specific skills, knowledge, and abilities (SKA) desired in someone who is an executive-level position. Although identifying the SKAs would seem an obvious first step in the process, it is frequently not done well.

Measuring "Leadership"

High-level administrators are sought for their talent at organizational and human resource management—not in terms of how well they know the agency's operational procedures. Substantive knowledge about the intricacies of the local criminal justice system is also unnecessary. Developing exercises to objectively measure those skills that are actually at a premium takes thoughtful work.

For example, what is an objective measure of "leadership" that can be included in a hiring process? Oral communications, written communications, and general knowledge about the corrections systems are much easier to document and to rate. The dimensions that are difficult to rate

are those which often make or break the administrator: management ability, judgment, fairness, ability to set priorities, skill in managing the external environment, the ability to

What objective measure of "leadership" can be included in a hiring process? Oral and written communications and general knowledge about the corrections system are much easier to document and to rate.

handle multiple crises, and interpersonal ability. Selecting administrators is also often made difficult by current or past employers' reluctance to give honest assessments of candidates.

Broward County's Selection Process

The typical selection process for high-level staff at BSO takes one day. All candidates begin early in the day with a brief orientation to the department and the position, and then timed, written exercises begin. These written exercises are designed to measure more than just specific corrections knowledge; they are structured to require integration of information, data, processes, and creativity. Grammar, spelling, and sentence structure are also graded.

After a morning of testing, the candidates are told which of their written responses to prepare for a videotaped response and then are given time to prepare the presentation. The length of the video response depends on the position, with higher-level positions generally doing longer video presentations of up to twenty minutes. Following this exercise, the candidates are given a more traditional interview in front of a panel.

Scores for each element, which have been graded separately, are compiled to identify the top candidates. Throughout the day, human resources staff are available to answer any of the candidates' questions not directly related to the specifics of the job—such as information on the benefit package.

Simulation of job-relevant activities is one way to gather considerable information about candidates. BSO's practice of requiring candidates to respond via video with no audience also provides a clear documentation of skills. I can tell you from first-

Because of budget constraints, few corrections agencies provide high-quality training for first-line supervisors and mid-managers.

hand experience that this is a stressful experience for candidates, requiring them to organize their thoughts, time their responses, and impart their comments in a poised and authoritative manner. Simulations can be also be created, using

role players who have been carefully schooled in how to ask questions and when to follow candidates' responses with additional questions.

The Importance of Selecting the Best Correctional Administrators

Our colleagues in the largest law enforcement agencies have for at least the last decade worked to perfect the selection of new police chiefs. Police chiefs are much more "public" appointments than their corrections peers, and selecting the "wrong" chief has potentially damaging results for those in political power. Selecting a police chief is often seen by the public as encompassing more than the selection of an individual. It constitutes the endorsement of a particular philosophy, a response to community concerns, or a need to rebuild after a crisis. The same level of public interest is often missing when corrections executives are selected, although the consequences of a poor selection are at least as important.

The job simulation for police chiefs may take the form of the chief candidates responding to a hostile "public" after

police have been involved in a shooting incident in a minority community. This type of simulation can quickly reveal the extent to which the candidate has the needed interpersonal abilities and crisis management skills. Most of us can

easily think of similar situations relevant to corrections that might be included in a hiring process for corrections executives.

Structuring this type of selection process requires the assistance of human resource professionals who can translate what the agency administrator wants into a valid selection process. Too often those of us who are unskilled in developing rating scales, in training assessors, and in creating the questions downplay the importance of this activity. Most agency administrators are familiar with the subtleties of the hiring process, but most of us are too impatient to let it develop.

The "how-to-do" of the hiring process is actually less important than deciding what we need to measure. I believe that too often our hiring processes for executive level staff are not focused on identifying leaders and managers, but instead reward people who have simply survived in the environment longer than others. Selecting executive-level staff can potentially become a very divisive issue when an agency seeks to fill high-ranking positions from outside the organization.

This brings me to my final point: the importance of grooming current staff for management-level positions.

Raising Our Own Managers

Most of us who are jail administrators and executives didn't begin our careers thinking we would long remain in the jail business; the consequence is that our ambivalence has contributed to a current shortage of executives willing and able to assume leadership roles.

Corrections agencies are notoriously poor at raising their own future managers and executives. Because of budget constraints, few agencies provide high-quality training for first-line supervisors and mid-managers. Nor do they accurately assess the current management skills of their staff in order to build training and mentoring programs that will yield the next generation of managers. In comparison to our colleagues in law enforcement, we have not invested time in the promotional assessment process-for either sworn staff or civilian staff-to promote the most-qualified individuals who have demonstrated the skills and ability needed to assume the next level of management responsibilities.

I believe that we must find the resources to develop executive talent in our own agencies. It is a morale blow to agency staff when the agency has to go outside its own organization to hire managers-especially top managers. On the other hand, it is deadly to an organization to promote from within staff who do not have the skills to be executives.

This dilemma is not easy or cheap to solve. The commitment to total staff development

requires more than annual in-service training. It requires the agency's funding sources to buy in to the need to "build"

managers and thus ultimately improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.

One way to encourage broader views is to encourage mid-managers to explore and expand their professional opportunities through networking, attending conferences, and participating in educational management opportunities-including those outside the corrections realm. How often do we attend ACA or AJA conferences only to run into the same people year after year, with the same individuals presenting workshops?

In Broward County, we are experimenting with putting twenty corrections mid-managers through a modified program of Total Quality Management (TQM). These individuals, both sworn and civilian staff, volunteered to participate in this sixty-hour program over a three-month period to help themselves "move into the 21st century" (our creative slogan to attract interest).

This foray into some very untraditional corrections management

The agency must buy in to the need to "build" managers and thus ultimately improve the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.

approaches has genuinely opened some minds.

What's Needed

How can we raise better managers? Certainly formal training and educational experiences are one part of the answer. Our law enforcement colleagues have for many years relied on the FBI's National Academy as a training ground for the profession's future leaders. The National Academy's impact has lessened over the years as many law enforcement officers have received college degrees before entering their careers. We should focus on creating a national initiative, with funds far beyond those currently available to the NIC Academy, to build similar expectations among corrections officials.

We should insist that community colleges, colleges, and universities with correctional administration programs become more visible, available, and as high in quality as law enforcement management programs.' I recently challenged a professor in the local state university's criminal justice program to develop a specialty field in corrections at the

master's degree level. Giving me a perplexed look, he said that would probably be difficult since five core courses would be required to have a corrections specialty, and he couldn't think what five courses that might be. Such lack of enlightenment among criminal justice academicians is disheartening. We must demand better.

Consider for a moment the example I provided recently to a reporter who called for information on the Broward Sheriffs Office's approach to executive recruiting.² In the fall of 1995, we initiated a recruitment process for the executive staff of a 1,000+ bed new generation jail in Broward County. We knew that our pool of available managers, while willing, had never worked in a direct supervision facility or been part of a transition team. We advertised in all the corrections magazines, sent the recruitment notice to colleagues across the country, and placed notices on the tables available at the ACA Winter Conference. The salary was competitive, with the added lure of the South Florida environment, and an agency recently ACA-accredited.

The result of our three to four months of recruiting at no small monetary cost? We received approximately fifty applications, screened to six who seemed highly qualified. Four of these individuals were interested enough to make the trip to South Florida for the interviews.

I contrast this experience with that of a small local police agency in Broward County, with fewer than twenty-five officers, that was recruiting for a police chief at the same time. That agency received almost 200 applications.

This difference may be interpreted in many different ways. To my mind, however, it points to the fact that there are not many managers available for top-level corrections positions. We need to develop a level of professionalism that will insist that the selection processes be structured, as well as less traditional. We should seek to identify the real leaders and challenge the candidates. We have a larger responsibility, however, to begin to take actions to find and develop the managers for tomorrow.

Unfortunately, state and local corrections is the growth industry as we move into the next century. This fact is sad enough without the prospect of having such incredible resources—both human and fiscal—poorly managed. Selection should be the easy part. It would be wonderful if we simply had to work long hours to identify the “best” from a large field of highly qualified candidates. If we do our job right, that should be our legacy to the future.

For more information contact Susan McCampbell, Director, Broward County Sheriff's Office; telephone (954) 831-8916.

Notes

1. Policing executives of the fifty largest agencies in the United States in 1978 created the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). PERF advances the agenda for large sized police agencies who believe that their unique needs and issues are often lost in memberships in the International Association of Chiefs of Police or the National Sheriffs' Association.

2. “Florida Sheriff's Office Says Extensive, Intense Interview Process Pays Off,” **The Corrections Professional**, Vol. 1, Issue 14, April 5, 1996. ■

Controlling Gangs Through Teamwork and Technology

**by Arnett Gaston, Ph.D.,
Chief of Management and
Planning, New York City
Department of Correction**

Gangs are not new to America's jails and prisons. Their existence can be traced to post-colonial times, as they emerged shortly after America changed its style of facility operations from penitentiary settings (in which inmates had no contact with each other) to congregate settings. The gangs in our facilities may originally have been protectionist in nature, but they have evolved into something quite different and significantly more problematic. They have become bolder and more sophisticated.

Gangs' philosophies often conflict with the responsibilities and mandates of those who are legally charged with their care, custody and control. They actively recruit members, and they network with affiliates outside the jail. Some of the larger, better organized gangs fiercely demand unquestioned loyalty and compliance, with disloyalty or non-compliance being sufficient reason for imposing a range of penalties—even a death sentence. Their ever-increasing numbers, as well as their level of complexity and sophistication, make gangs a force that

corrections and law enforcement can ill afford to ignore.

Just as gangs are not new to our jails, neither are they rare. They are part of our social fabric. Gangs have existed for centuries in various cultures throughout the world. America, the world's "melting pot," has incorporated many of the earth's inhabitants into its social structure, simultaneously incorporating both the positive and negative aspects of their indigenous cultures. This has greatly influenced America's own culture, with gangs on occasion making significant (albeit notorious) contributions to its history.

It is not surprising, then, that our jails and prisons, as microcosms of the greater society, include gangs among their populations. Nor is it surprising that it is our large jails—like our large urban areas—that experience the most serious gang-related problems.

The Problems Gangs Pose to Jail Management

The behavior of gangs ranges from disruptive to dangerous. The psychology of gang behavior cannot co-exist with institutional behavior,

i.e., with behavior required of people who are incarcerated.

As in the free society, inter-gang conflicts occur in jails. One significant type of conflict is territorial. Such "turf" wars pose a greater threat in jail than in the free society because most large jails have little if any excess space, so it is impossible for gangs to separate and establish boundaries. Encroachment is a natural consequence of jails, whose already limited space is in many

Gangs' "turf" wars pose a greater threat in jail than in free society because most jails have little—if any—excess space, so it is impossible for gangs to separate and establish boundaries.

instances exacerbated by crowding. If gangs and their behavior are allowed to exist and proliferate, the risks to security, other inmates, and staff escalate.

Another reason for prohibiting gangs is the likelihood of intra-gang conflicts. Battles for leadership or the consequences of gang "splinter" factions disagreeing with the main body are amplified due to lack of space, which minimizes the possibility of "backing off" and "saving face."

Perhaps the most important reason for disallowing gang behavior in jail is the gang's need to challenge authority. This is a basic characteristic of gang behavior, and in some instances the reason the gang has formed. If there is anything a jail administration unequivocally cannot tolerate, it is any unlawful or unsanctioned challenge to its authority. Gang behavior is the antithesis of institutional behavior simply because the element of control is key to both. Gangs and gang behavior cannot be tolerated in the jail environment, because power and authority cannot be shared. One has only to review the history of our nation's jails and prisons to understand the disruptive, and all too often tragic consequences of such challenges.

Most challenges to authority involve collective rather than individual participation. In some instances, disruption is a planned activity of

The New York City Department of Correction has 1,153 inmates identified as members of thirty-two different gangs and gang-like organizations—both large, well-organized gangs with national reputations and smaller local groups.

organized gangs. In other situations, disruption is a spontaneous or unplanned activity of individuals, which, if left unchecked, can evolve into collective behavior indicative of gang activity. Whether organized or loose-knit, neither type of disruption is acceptable, and jail administrators today recognize the need to be

preemptive rather than reactive in addressing gang behavior.

Background: New York City Department of Correction

The New York City Department of Correction, at peak operating capacity, has a total of 22,871 beds in sixteen facilities. Approximately 85 percent of those beds are in ten facilities located on Rikers Island, a 432-acre island, triangulated by LaGuardia Airport and the boroughs of Bronx and Queens. One of the Rikers Island facilities has two floating annexes, which are ferry-boats converted for use as jails.

Among the jails on Rikers Island are an infirmary and a specially-equipped facility devoted to inmates with communicable diseases. The remaining six facilities are located in four of the five boroughs of New York City, including an 800-bed self-contained,

completely equipped floating facility moored in the Bronx. The department has four hospital wards,

including one for terminally ill inmates, and a Transportation Division. In addition, it operates four major court detention facilities that expedite court appearances in the five boroughs.

The New York City Department of Correction has 1,153 inmates identi-

lied as members of thirty-two different gangs and gang-like organizations. These gangs range from large, well-organized gangs such as the Bloods, Crips, and Latin Rings, which have national reputations and affiliations, to smaller local groups. They run the gamut in terms of ethnicity, age, and gender.

Components of the Gang Control Program

The New York City Department of Correction has put in place a program that has proven successful in controlling gang behavior. The program is based on both teamwork and technology. Its result has been a major reduction in violence attributable to gangs, as well as equally significant reductions in other problems associated with gangs in jails. What follows is a brief explanation of how the department's efficient and cost-effective program was successfully implemented.

Phase 1: Database on gangs.

The first phase in developing the program was to initiate an effective intelligence and communications network that would accurately indicate how many inmates have gang affiliations, which gangs they are affiliated with, and their status within those gangs. The database also provides information on which facilities gang members are in and their institutional classification.

All this information provides the department with data on the proliferation or concentration of any group, so

that it can forecast where or when a build-up of a particular group could cause problems. Strategic transfers and other movements assist the department in controlling the establishment of gang power bases and in ensuring that some individuals do not have undue influence over others. This undertaking, successful largely due to the team effort of the department's Security Risk Group Unit and the various facilities of the department, has led to the implementation of additional technology that makes the department's program even more effective.

Phase 2: Digitized imaging

program. As a second phase, the New York City Department of Correction has developed a digitized imaging program that offers numerous advantages for identifying gang members and their status, behavior, and control. The complete history and personal data of gang members are recorded, and digitized images (front and side) are taken.

Digitized images are also made of any tattoos, distinguishing marks, or scars. These images are sharper than those usually obtained by film, thereby negating the need for taking additional photographs, or for film storage or development. The digitized images are entered into a computer and downloaded into the database. The process takes about two minutes per individual and results in a permanent record that can be promptly updated as circumstances warrant.

Each facility is able to update records quickly. Changes are simultaneously downloaded to a central repository so the department has expedient, accurate information regarding new gang members or changes in the status of current members.

An advantage of this system is that it is possible to conduct single and multiple searches on the basis of any data in the file. For instance, if one inmate gang member reported being attacked by another inmate but could not identify the inmate by name, a timely departmental search could be accomplished based on any information the victim could give us. If the victim stated that the attacker was about five feet tall, with a moustache, and that he had a tattoo of a dragon on the right hand, a computerized departmental search could be expeditiously conducted. Every registered person in the entire gang network who fit that description would be displayed on the screen in a photo array-constituting a virtual "computerized line-up." Screens could also be altered to focus on points of interest, by enlarging images of areas in which there are scars, tattoos, or other distinguishing marks.

A major operational advantage is that the system can either be stationary or portable. If it is neither safe nor prudent to bring inmates to a specific site, then an ordinary camcorder with a flash attachment or a digitized camera can be taken to the site. After the pictures are taken, they can be returned to where they can either be digitized or

downloaded, depending on the equipment used. This is an additional advantage if a crime scene must be photographed. The digitized image of the crime scene can be enlarged on command, which is much more efficient than using the time-consuming process of enlarging prints off a negative.

Advantages Provided by the System

It is possible to query the system about specific affiliations between gang members, who visits them, and if their visitors are visiting other gang members, thereby possibly acting as couriers. The technology can also automatically flag gang members who should be kept separate from other individuals in the system. The agency can be kept current on all court or police activity, case disposition, warrants, new intelligence that affects a gang member's status, or any other factor that could be important.

Because each facility has the ability to input information on its own gang members, the department can quickly be notified of gangs' status changes, who the new leaders are, where they are, and so forth. If gang members change their appearance, this information can also be entered in a timely fashion and become part of the record. Transfers from one facility to another are tracked as they take place, so administrators can assess what risks such transfers pose.

If the data indicate certain movements, gang build-up, or other security threats, the agency can intervene. Interventions include conducting surprise searches, transferring specific gang leaders to minimize their influence, dispersing gang gatherings during recreation, and minimizing other opportunities for congregate activity.

Reviewing information in this database also provides an indication, when correlated with other data, of when and where it would be most expedient to conduct tactical searches. The database also minimizes inmates' movement when records have to be updated. Because the inmate's image is stored in a database along with all other information, it is not necessary to take additional pictures (except if an inmates's appearance has been altered). Unlimited reproductions of the stored image can be produced. This is extremely helpful when several facilities or agencies need to receive information simultaneously. Images can be electronically enhanced to aid identification.

Another significant benefit of the system is that if a facility uses digitized cameras, the cost of film can be eliminated. A comparatively inexpensive method of digitization is to use the standard camcorder found in most institutions and purchase a relatively inexpensive video capture apparatus (usually costing about \$200) to attach to any existing 386 or 486 computer that has eight megabytes of random access memory

(RAM). If a network is utilized, sixteen megs of RAM are recommended. The pictures taken by the camcorder can be digitized through the video capture

apparatus, and that video cassette can be used over and over to record more pictures that can also be digitized. This is

what the New York City Department of Correction has done. We are so encouraged by our success that we intend to digitize images of all inmates entering our system. Last year, more than 125,000 were admitted.

Conclusion

Our success speaks for itself. This administration has experienced no significant negative gang activity, no major disruptions, and no major breaches of security associated with gang behavior. We are confident that, as we expand our efforts through teamwork and technology, we will enhance our ability to continue providing a safe and secure environment.

For additional information, contact Arnett Gaston, Chief of Management and Planning, New York City Department of Correction; telephone (212) 266-1809. ■

Because each facility can input information on its own gang members, the department can quickly be notified of gangs' status changes, who the new leaders are, where they are, and whether members have changed their appearance.

The Crunch Is On: Pinellas County Reinvents Its Jail

**by Harold B. Wilber,
Commander, Pinellas County
Jail, Largo, Florida**

I recently heard the following statement: "Ten years ago, most government organizations were working at 30 percent efficiency, and now they are working at 70 percent." If this is true, then what accounts for the change? Are bureaucrats employing the effective management principles of Peters and other management gurus or are they changing out of necessity because they are being denied more resources?

I suspect that the answer is "both." This article points out some ways for managers of county jails to become more efficient in dealing with the budget crunch that most of us now face. We have employed these techniques effectively at our jail in Pinellas County, Florida.

In many ways correctional administrators today are confronted by two seemingly dichotomous trends: a growing number of prisoners, and zero growth in or ever-decreasing budgets. In the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office and jail, this was certainly the situation. The apparent solutions looked simple, but applying them was not so simple.

Changing Employees' Attitudes

Our first effort was to address staff attitudes. I have been in public service for thirty years and have often listened to the refrain of subordinates: "I need more people."

Over the years we have become used to throwing money or people at problems, and our organizations have grown accordingly. Now, through their elected officials, the taxpayers have said, "Enough is enough." Elected officials are responding by taking a no-growth stance or even cutting budgets.

It was important for our staff to come to terms with this reality. They could not expect increases such as they had seen in the past, nor could they use the excuse of "not enough people" to avoid doing things that must be done.

After this attitude adjustment took hold through a "What part of no don't you understand?" approach, we did a complete assessment of all aspects of our operations.

Evaluating the Front End

We started by looking at where our prisoners were coming from and asking the following questions:

- How are prisoners getting to jail? i.e., what agency is transporting them? Are the arresting city police transporting them?
- Should these prisoners even be arrested or brought to jail? Could they be given Notices to Appear?
- Is the pretrial release program effective? Do the interviewers screen seven days a week? Can schedules be adjusted? What is the failure-to-appear rate?
- Is objective classification done?
- Are direct supervision techniques employed?

Remember that these are just examples of some questions we asked. Other administrators are limited only by their imaginations. Walking around and chatting with staff provided much insight and generated additional questions.

Cutting the Paperwork Trail

In assessing our whole operation, we looked at every piece of paperwork our staff generated or responded to, and then we asked if it was really necessary.

For example, I discovered an elaborate weekly statistical report that was being filled out but was not based on any statutory or regulatory requirement. I asked the boss if he could do without it and he agreed that he could.

As we looked at our staff, in a sense we had to avoid looking at our staff. That is, we looked at staff positions and didn't confuse faces with spaces. We asked what the mission of our agency was, and then we looked at the positions in the budget that supported that mission.

We asked ourselves the tough question: "Could we live without this or that position?" A fancy title on a position gave us a clue that the position might not be required by a higher authority. We considered our inmate-to-staff ratio, too, as well as the ratio of line staff to supervisors.

Saving Salaries

We next looked at the way staff positions were graded and whether the positions called for sworn or non-certified personnel. We asked our oversight agency, the Department of Corrections, to review the line-up of our sworn security positions. We then changed those that could be eliminated or manned by unsworn staff. We were thus able to save significant amounts in salaries and in high-risk retirement costs.

To reinforce the attitude adjustment of our staff regarding allocation of personnel, I required that whenever

they sought additional staff increases they must also identify compensatory reductions. We also followed up on inspections that had been done by others outside the organization. Those fresh looks were quite helpful.

Assessing Past Relationships

We found it important to stay focused on our mission in reviewing budgeted positions. This was because, over the years, local customs, practices, and favors to other agencies had resulted in our organization performing functions having little, if anything, to do with our essential purpose.

This situation is a difficult one to fix. It requires good diplomacy along with reminders of the agency's limited funding. Our department's entire assessment and adjustment process called for boldness throughout. We had to be risk-takers.

Reorganizing

We looked for opportunities to flatten or otherwise streamline our agency and its operations. Again, we reviewed our mission and functions and rearranged some boxes and lines differently on paper to see if, for any reason, there were any excesses or improper line-ups.

After we reviewed the arrangement of positions in our budget, we looked to see if the appropriately classified people were actually working in

these positions and performing the specific functions called for.

I saw an organizational chart once that did not make sense to me. The reason was that some people and functions had been moved from their appropriate placement because of personality conflicts among staff in various positions.

As we looked at our staffing, we asked questions such as:

- Where are there shortages and why?
- Are there "loaners" out, where, for how long, and why?
- When were the last job task analyses done?
- When were position descriptions updated?
- Are there written job descriptions in the fiscal and personnel offices?
- Where is the overtime pay going? why?

Minimizing Staff Anxiety

Our reviews naturally created staff anxiety, but we minimized their worries by including as many staff as possible in the analyses. We were not about firing people. We were managing. Besides, as a practical matter, in most public systems today it is impossible to fire anyone as a

result of the kinds of reviews we were doing. Normal attrition and the realignment of personnel absorbed the needed adjustments. In addition to saving money, we even promoted some staff.

Reviewing Big-Ticket Items

The mission, operations, and staffing review also included an evaluation of our capital and operating costs, especially the big-ticket items like food, health care, and vehicles. Again, it was necessary to ask cost-analysis questions. We addressed issues such as the possibility of privatizing food services, health care, commissary, and other areas. We asked, "Should we automate? Are we charging inmates wherever we can?"

We also reviewed which staff had been assigned vehicles and why. In some cases, employees had used government vehicles in a previous position, and they kept the allowance after they transferred to a position in which the vehicle was not required. Our discontinuance of car allowances certainly got attention, gave credibility to the seriousness of our efforts, and perhaps was responsible for some of the beneficial suggestions we received from other staff.

The Ultimate Lesson: Creativity Is the Key

We learned that we must always be creative. The challenge of corrections and its increasing demands require us to be innovative. Intermediate sanctions and volunteerism can help reduce the pressure on jail systems, but they are just other dimensions of our business-not panaceas.

The national pressure to get tough on crime will continue to front-load our systems. It is therefore important for us to be able to say honestly that we will do more with less.

We did not let the budget crunch in Pinellas County get us down. We discovered there was some fat in our agency and that we could do something about it. The bottom line: Our review resulted in nearly \$1 million in savings.

For more information, contact Harold Wilber, Jail Commander, Pinellas County Jail, at (813) 464-6336. ■

This article is based on an article that appeared in County News, the biweekly publication of the National Association of Counties.

Because the national pressure to get tough on crime will continue to front-load our systems, it is important to be able to say honestly that we will do more with less.

Sharing Information Via the Internet: A Large Jail Network Mailing List

**by Eric Miller,
Project Manager, Justice
Management Division,
U.S. Department of Justice,
and Sharla Rausch, Ph.D.,
Senior Research Analyst, NIC**

The idea for this initiative originated with Art Wallenstein, Ring County, Washington, who asked NIC to identify how the Internet could be used for sharing information among members of the Large Jail Network (LJN). Sharla Rausch, NIC, and Eric Miller, U.S. Department of Justice, met with the Jails Committee at the February 1996 NIC Advisory Board Meeting to discuss the LJN's specific communication needs.

As a result of that discussion, the "mailing list" was identified as the best vehicle for sharing information among members. For the June LJN meeting, Eric and Sharla were asked to summarize the features of mailing lists and what LJN members would need in order to participate in a LJN mailing list. The following is based on the report presented at that meeting.

Because the mailing list will contain the e-mail addresses of all LJN participants, any message sent to this alias will automatically go to all LJN members.

What is a Mailing List?

A mailing list is an "alias" on the Internet that, in this case, will represent the LJN. Because it contains the e-mail addresses of all LJN participants, any message sent to this alias will automatically go to all LJN members. The mailing list can offer the following advantages:

- LJN members can use it to discuss important issues, share information, and post notices-all done instantly.
- Special topics mailing lists can easily be created for subgroups of LJN members who are especially interested in a particular subject.
- LJN members will also be able to send messages to individuals-not the whole group-by using a personal e-mail address.

Because this mailing list will be private, not public, a list administrator will be responsible for adding and removing addresses. This function can be performed by DOJ staff, unless LJN members would prefer it to be administered elsewhere.

Technology Needed to Communicate via an LJN Mailing List

In order to participate in the mailing list, you do not need access to the World Wide Web, nor do you need a graphical Web Browser such as Netscape or Mosaic. You do need access to the Internet and the hardware and software.

1. Access to an Internet account.

• **Possible free sources:** Internet accounts are often available through your local, municipal, county, or state government. If your facility has a local area network (LAN) with electronic mail software, it may already have a gateway connection that will permit you to communicate with the Internet. To find out, ask your LAN administrator. If your jurisdiction does not offer Internet service, check with nearby colleges and universities to see if you or your facility can obtain an account from them.

• **Commercial sources:** Your agency also can obtain an account from a commercial *internet service provider*. These accounts cost between \$12 and \$30 per month, with varying billing plans. For instance, some services charge a flat monthly rate and others bill for time used. You can also send and

receive electronic mail from any **on-line service** that advertises that it can exchange mail with the Internet. America Online and CompuServ are examples of such services. They tend to be more expensive than the "pure" Internet access accounts.

2. A personal computer (PC), modem, and communications software. The relative power of the PC, the type of communications software, and the speed of the modem determine the kind of service subscription you will get.

- **Shell account.** The most basic (and often the cheapest) is called a "shell account." This type of access is often called "character mode" because you can see only characters on your computer screen, not graphics or pictures. For this kind of access, almost any PC will work. You will need to find out from your service provider what kind of terminal your computer must emulate (or look like) to be compatible with its service. With that information, you can purchase the terminal emulation software, usually for less than \$100. A relatively slow modem will work fairly well on this type of service, as the characters being sent to the computer do not require as much speed as graphics and pictures. A modem that operates at 9600 baud will provide good service and should be available for between \$100 and \$200.

- **Commercial on-line service.** For these services (such as America Online and CompuServ), you will generally need a PC capable of running Windows (and you will need a copy of the Windows software). A faster modem will be needed to handle the graphics that this kind of connection is capable of providing—the faster the better. At present, the fastest modems in mass production run at a speed of 28800 baud and cost from \$200 to \$500. The good news is that the service provider will make the necessary software available as part of your subscription.

- **Full Internet account.** For a full Internet account, you will need equipment similar to that for a commercial on-line service. Ask the service provider if it will provide the necessary software; many do. Because configuring this kind of connection can be more difficult, be sure to ask about technical support. Some service providers will install the software if you bring your PC to their shop.

What's Involved in Using the LJN Mailing List to Communicate?

1. Electronic mail address. With any of the services described above, you will receive an electronic mail address. This is generally in the form **username@organization.dom**. Your individual user name appears to the left of the @ symbol and the name of the Internet computer (to which you

connect) appears to the right of the symbol.

2. Creation of the LJN mailing list. To create the mailing list, the mailing list administrator will collect the e-mail addresses of all participating members. Only those addresses that are included in the LJN mailing list will receive or have access to the information sent over the Internet.

3. Sending and receiving mail. Techniques for sending and receiving mail vary with each service provider. Your service provider should provide instructions on how to use the software on its system.

The LJN mailing list will be assigned its own mailing address, which will be in the same form as a personal address. The computer will automatically translate this into a message to be sent to each individual member of the LJN mailing list. After reading incoming messages from the list, you can simply reply to the message, and your reply will be "broadcast" to all members of the group. If it is more appropriate, you can specify one or more personal mail addresses. Or, as noted above, if participants are interested in having separate mailing lists for different subgroups or topics, these can be easily created.

For further information contact Sharla Rausch, Ph.D., Senior Research Analyst, National Institute of Corrections; telephone (800) 995-6423, ext. 114. ■

The Role of the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Pretrial Detention

**by Jim Zangs,
Detention Administrator,
Community Corrections and
Detention Division, Federal
Bureau of Prisons**

The question of how prisoners awaiting trial in the United States Federal Courts are housed seems complex and confusing to those not familiar with the system. Even those who work within the system find it a little bewildering at times.

The United States Marshals Service (USMS), an agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, is responsible for all Federal prisoners detained for judicial proceedings. However, the USMS does not operate its own detention facilities. This role therefore falls partly to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, an agency of the U.S. Department of Justice.

History

Until the 1970s, the Bureau of Prisons confined primarily sentenced prisoners. The USMS depended solely on state and local units of government to confine persons detained for violations of Federal laws or those who were being held as material witnesses in a Federal prosecution. There were occasional

problems with this system, but essentially it worked well for many years.

As the Federal detention population began to grow in the 1960s however, it became increasingly difficult for local jails to provide space for all the Federal prisoners. This was especially true in some large metropolitan areas, where the substantial growth in the Federal jail population began to overtax the local resources.

The Metropolitan Correctional Centers

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, it became apparent that the system for holding Federal pretrial detainees had to be addressed. The Bureau of Prisons was asked to develop plans for Metropolitan Correctional Centers (MCCs) in areas where the need for Federal detention facilities was the most critical. However, the planning process originally intended to address this specific need was quickly thrown into a larger arena in which corrections professionals, academicians, and elected officials were addressing concerns about obsolete and overcrowded jails throughout the country. As a result,

the Bureau of Prisons' task became not only to provide for the detention needs of the Federal jail population in certain large metropolitan cities, but also to build detention facilities to serve as models in a major national

From the early 1980s and continuing to the present, there has been unprecedented growth in the Federal jail population—from 4,000 prisoners in 1981 to over 23,000 today.

effort supported by the discretionary and block grant authority of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA).

Historically, the Bureau of Prisons did have some experience in running jails. In the 1930s and '40s, for example, the Bureau operated the Federal Detention Headquarters at New Orleans in the old Federal Court House. In 1930, the Bureau also took over operation of the New York Detention Headquarters in Manhattan, which it ran until 1974. Facilities for Federal jail prisoners were also built in La Tuna, Texas, and Milan, Michigan. These latter two institutions housed some pretrial prisoners, but they also provided a place for misdemeanants to serve their sentences. La Tuna and Milan later became Federal Correctional Institutions housing sentenced inmates.

**Large Jail Network Bulletin
Annual Issue 1996**

The new facilities the Bureau planned and built in the 1960s and 1970s were radically different from the early jails, however. MCCs were high-rise facilities in downtown locations, adjacent to or near a Federal court house. The architects' new designs created buildings that fit into their urban environment, and the facilities provided secure functional living areas for prisoners without traditional steel grille work. It was also possible to house male and female prisoners in the same building.

MCCs were designed to provide an array of services to the Federal courts in addition to the pretrial detention function. These services included conducting psychological and psychiatric evaluations of prisoners for the court, housing convicted Federal offenders with short sentences, providing detention space for high security witnesses, and offering some community-based programs as sentencing alternatives.

The first MCC was completed in November 1974 in San Diego, and two quickly followed in 1975 in New York and Chicago. These high-rise, short-term detention facilities were located in the downtown areas, near the Federal courts, the offices of the U.S. Marshals Service and other components of the Federal criminal

justice system. The MCCs were radically different from any existing jails in the country and had a significant impact on future jail construction. These facilities became known as "new generation jails."

The MCCs had several features that set them apart from the traditional jail. The housing areas were divided into semi-autonomous functional units, each with its own space for recreation, unit staff offices, and food service. Each unit was designed as a pod in which the cells surrounded a day room. This allowed a correctional officer to see the fronts of all cells in the unit and, simultaneously, to supervise inmates continuously. The design contrasted with the traditional jail's linear design with its typical cell block of long rows of cells. Traditional jails allowed only intermittent supervision of inmates in their cells when the officer walked down the tier. Much of the subsequent jail construction in this country has imitated the MCCs' podular design.

Responding to Continuing Growth in the Federal Jail Population

Of course, the role of the Bureau of Prisons in detaining the Federal jail population did not end with the MCCs in San Diego, New York, and Chicago.

From the early 1980s and continuing to the present,

there has been unprecedented growth in the Federal jail population—from 4,000 prisoners in 1981 to over 23,000 today. As this population grew, the Bureau of Prisons was called on to assist the U.S. Marshals Service in housing ever greater numbers of prisoners. The original MCCs at San Diego, New York, and Chicago had approximately 1,000 beds available for the U.S. Marshals Service prisoners. Today the Bureau is providing almost 10,000 beds for USMS prisoners.

This increase was accomplished in part by constructing additional MCCs in other urban areas. These facilities' names were changed to Metropolitan Detention Center (MDC) and Federal Detention Center (FDC). These new facilities are:

- MDC Brooklyn;
- MDC Guaynabo (Puerto Rico);
- MDC Los Angeles; and
- FDC Miami.

The Bureau also built individual jail units at existing Federal prisons and converted space at others to provide for the growing jail population. In addition to the MCCs, MDCs, and FDC, seventeen other Federal institutions have units specifically dedicated to this jail mission. In a few of these institutions, the jail units hold only thirty or forty beds. In most cases there are 150 to 250 jail beds, and in a few cases there are several hundred beds.

The MCCs were radically different from any existing jails in the country and had a significant impact on future jail construction, becoming known as "new generation jails."

The institutions with these jail units are the Federal Correctional Institutions at Fairton, New Jersey; Otisville, New York; Ray Brook, New York; Schuylkill, Pennsylvania; Memphis, Tennessee; Milan, Michigan; Morgantown, West Virginia; Petersburg, Virginia; Tallahassee, Florida; Englewood, Colorado; Fort Worth, Texas; Seagoville, Texas; Dublin, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Tucson, Arizona; Sheridan, Oregon; and also the U.S. Penitentiary in Atlanta, Georgia.

Meeting the Continuing Need for Additional Space

Bureau of Prisons and U.S. Marshals Service staff are members of the Department of Justice Detention Planning Committee, which meets regularly to assess, discuss, and address the continuing need to locate additional detention space. Current approaches include the following:

- The U.S. Marshals Service continues to obtain State and local beds through the use of intergovernmental agreements.
- Where appropriate, the private sector is also being looked to for detention space.
- Finally, Federal detention space continues to be constructed. At present, MDCs or FDCs are under construction or in design at Seattle, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Houston, and Hawaii.

Today, the U.S. Marshals Service still has the primary responsibility for housing pretrial and other prisoners that appear in Federal courts. However, on any given day more than 30 percent of those prisoners are actually housed in a facility operated by the Bureau of Prisons. The remaining 70 percent are housed by the Marshals Service in state and local facilities through intergovernmental agreements and, occasionally, in private facilities. At times, prisoners are transferred between facilities, depending on their court dates and the availability of bed space.

This system may seem complex, but it works well and saves money by taking advantage of resources available through local, state, and Federal agencies.

For additional information, contact Jim Zangs, Detention Administrator, Community Corrections and Detention Division, Federal Bureau of Prisons; (202) 514-8578. ■

Nearly 70 percent of Federal prisoners are housed in state and local facilities or, occasionally, in private facilities.

Recommended Reading

Communications in Corrections-Supplement. Stucker, John J.; Smith, Gretchen M.; Sprecher, Rob. National Institute of Corrections (Washington, DC), 1995. Sponsored by National Institute of Corrections (Washington, DC). 16 p.

This supplement describes the communications audits, technical assistance, and small grant projects supported by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) during this communications improvement program. The report summarizes communication issues and effective strategies for improvement. Topics discussed include community relations, media relations, corrections policy, internal communications, and organizational development. Included is a summary of the steps involved in developing a strategic communications plan.

Contract Health Care: Is It a Cure for Ailing Services or a Curse? Hill, Janice B. Pinellas County Sheriff's Office (Clearwater, FL), 1992? 68 p. A nine-page paper briefly discusses issues of health care contracting, followed by a checklist for evaluating contract health care providers'

compliance with specific criteria. The document also includes a forty-six page agreement between the Sheriff of Pinellas County and Prison Health Services for provision of contract health services.

Impact of the "Three Strikes Law" on the Criminal Justice System in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County. Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee. Three Strikes Subcommittee (Los Angeles, CA), 1995. 58 p.

This study is a discussion of how the criminal justice system in Los Angeles county has changed in response to the new "Three Strikes Law." It focuses on the law's impact on case processing, on the jails, and on other systems. Cost analysis and an overview of strike cases are included.

Jail Facility Site Evaluation and Selection. Ricci, Kenneth. 1996? Sponsored by National Institute of Corrections. Jails Division (Longmont, CO). 27 p.

This paper discusses the issues associated with finding a site for a new jail and lays out a process of site selec-

tion that addresses public fears and the demands of security, economy, and functionality. It details the site selection process in five steps.

Managers Guide to Disturbance Control. National Institute of Corrections (Washington, DC), 1995? 23 p.

This report briefly describes the philosophy and policy of handling disturbances, as well as the command centers, communications, tactics, equipment, and support services needed during a disturbance. Other topics discussed are inmate management and mutual aid from other facilities and outside agencies.

Podular Direct Supervision Jails: 1995 Directory. National Institute of Corrections. Jails Division (Longmont, CO); LIS, Inc. (Longmont, CO); National Institute of Corrections Information Center (Longmont, CO), 1995. 123 p.

This document was developed as a resource for those interested in the direct supervision concept of jail design and management. It locates direct supervision facilities and provides basic information on the design, bedspace, and other aspects of the facilities listed. The three categories of jails covered are: podular direct supervision jails (both planned and operating), jails converted to

Single copies of these documents may be requested by contacting the NIC Information Center at (800) 877-1461 or sending your request to 1860 Industrial Circle, Suite A, Longmont, Colorado, 80501.

direct supervision, and jails that have a combination of design styles. The information presented is drawn from questionnaires completed by jail staff.

A Review of the Correctional System's Delivery of Health Services. Institute for Law and Policy Planning (Berkeley, CA); Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office (Tampa, FL), 1994. Sponsored by Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office (Tampa, FL). 42 p. This review and evaluation of Hillsborough County detention system's delivery of medical services identifies major sources of health care expenditures and hidden costs and recommends ways of achieving greater cost efficiency. It includes such topics as: third party reimbursements, current health care delivery, and utilization reviews, with an emphasis on the impact on overall public health.

Sheriffs Jail Linkage System: SJLS Information Network. Sheriff's Jail Linkage System (Columbus, OH), 1995? 14 p. This document contains an informational pamphlet about the Sheriff's Jail Linkage System (SJLS) as well as a newsletter from this organization. The SJLS is a non-profit organization of the Michigan Sheriff's Association and the Buckeye State (Ohio) Sheriff's Association. The informational pamphlet states that the primary goal of SJLS is to create a more complete prisoner activity

history data base. The pamphlet also describes the services offered by SJLS. The newsletter covers information systems.

State Prisoners in County Jails: Who Wins, Who Loses? Mackie, Kelly K. National Association of Counties. Research Dept. (Washington, DC), 1994. 34 p. The latest data for 1993 reveal a total of 52,721 state inmates in county jails because of overcrowding at the state level. This document is the first of a series of reports on the problems counties are facing with regards to their jail populations. Among the topics considered are: prison overcrowding; the role of jails; state arrangements with counties; and a state by state analysis of state prisoners in county jails (including reimbursement arrangements). ■

